

## MI Child Support Formula - Proposed child support changes

---

**From:** <Tammy>  
**To:** <MCSF@courts.mi.gov>  
**Date:** 6/24/2003 3:22 PM  
**Subject:** Proposed child support changes

---

I would like to share my opinions regarding the proposed child support changes. I am a mother that receives child support for one child. I have been receiving support since 1993.

I have several concerns regarding these changes. My son currently spends every other weekend with his father as well as occasional holidays, and on a very rare occasion, a vacation. I do not agree that he should be entitled to a credit for this time spent with his son. My house payment, utilities, medical costs, etc. do not decrease because he is gone two weekends a month. I am the one that provides clothing that I have to pack every time he goes to his dad's house for a visit. I am the one that pays his monthly ice bill to play hockey. I am the one that provides medical insurance for him and pays the monthly orthodontist bill. When his father is not working (or at least claims that he is not working) I do not receive support at all. Exactly what would he be getting a credit for?

Since you are considering that only one parent would need to provide health care insurance, I would also like to know if my monthly net income would be adjusted to show that I am the one that provides the medical, dental and vision insurance for my child? If not, why?

I ask that you please reconsider the changes to the child support formula. There are many mothers out there that need the child support that they receive. Especially when the father doesn't participate in the rising costs of rearing their child.

I would like to make a suggestion; maybe you need to be more concerned about the fathers that find a way to lie and cheat the system to get their support lowered constantly or just don't pay at all when they are out of work. There has to be a better answer than the one I received from Friend of the Court when I brought it to their attention that not only was he collecting unemployment benefits but was also working daily for cash. The reply that I received was, "if he's not receiving a paycheck, then there is nothing that we can do about it." Instead of trying to do something about it, they are going to lower his support obligation to \$46.00 per week, which is half of what he was paying. They are also reducing his portion of uninsured medical costs from 50% to 16.9%. So not only am I the one providing and paying for monthly coverage, I am also responsible for 83.1% of anything that is not covered. Does this seem fair to you? Do you really believe that \$46.00 is an adequate amount to help raise a child and pay for any of the child's needs? Should I be penalized because my ex-husband can't seem to hold a job consistently? Should my child suffer or have to go without because of it?

Again, please reconsider these changes. It's bad enough that fathers are getting away with little or no financial responsibility to their children, but to give them a credit on top of it is absurd. This is an insult and a slap in the face to mothers and most importantly, to the children.